REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-5, 7-17, and 29-32 are pending. In the present response, claims 18-28 are cancelled, claims 1-5, 7-14, 16, 17, and 29-31 are amended, and claims 33 and 34 are added. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-17, and 29-34 are pending.

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative during an April 15, 2010 telephonic interview in which the outstanding rejections were discussed. During the interview, proposed arguments and amendments to claim 1 were discussed, in particular noting that "access privileges are defined … independent of any events scheduled on the first party's calendar" as well as related language are distinguishable from event-based access privileges (as disclosed in Vincent, the primary cited reference). No agreement was reached; however, the Examiner agreed to consider the amendments and arguments further upon receipt of a written response.

Prior Rejections and Corresponding Remarks

Claims 1-5, 8-17, and 29-32 were previously rejected as being obvious over US Patent No. 4,881,179 to Vincent (Vincent) in view of US Patent No. 6,369,840 to Barnett et al. (Barnett) under 35 USC §103(a). Claim 7 was rejected as being obvious over Vincent in view of Barnett and further in view of US Patent No. 5,930,801 to Falkenhainer under 35 USC §103(a). In light of the amendments to the claims and the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to amended claim 1, the cited references do not teach or suggest at least "wherein the one or more defined access privileges are defined for specific time-slots of the plurality of time-slots of the first party's calendar,

independent of whether there are any events scheduled on the first party's calendar during the first time-slot, and if there are events scheduled on the first party's calendar during the first time-slot, independent of any access privileges defined for such events ..."

Vincent discloses a calendaring system in which various security levels may be defined based on the desired security access for various events. There is no teaching or suggestion of the above discussed time-slot based calendaring method.

In particular, Vincent does not teach or suggest "access privileges [that] are defined for specific time-slots ... independent of whether there are any events scheduled ... any access privileges defined for such events" as recited in claim 1. Instead, Vincent defines access based on an event security level, or assigns security access privileges to an individual so that such an individual may access events at or below their security access level. In contrast, claim 1 specifically recites that the access privileges are defined for time slots "independent of whether there are any events scheduled on the first party's calendar during the first time-slot, and if there are events scheduled on the first party's calendar during the first time-slot, independent of any access privileges defined for such events ..." See the Specification from page 10, line 7 to page 11, line 20, for support for such features. The system/method permits granting of access privileges (such as read or write access) for a time slot (page 10, lines 8-10). Further, the particular time-slots to which the access privileges apply can be defined (page 11, lines 3-8).

Vincent allows a first party to enter an event into his/her calendar and to indicate in that event the security level access for that event. Then, a second party possessing that level of security access can later view the event. Thus, the access level/privilege is defined for the event, not for the time-slot. Vincent discloses assigning a security access level to an individual, which allows that individual to access events that are at or below that individual's access level. However, the access levels in Vincent simply define which events an individual may view depending on the defined security level of the event and the individual's designated security access level. Thus, in accordance with Vincent, if a first party has entered

two events into his/her calendar, one that is Confidential and one that is
Unclassified, a second party having a permission level of Unrestricted would only be
able to view the second of those two events regardless of the time-slots in which
those events occur. That is because the security access of Vincent is event-
dependent, whereas in claim 1, "access privileges are defined for specific time-slots
… independent of whether there are any events scheduled on the first party's
calendar during the first time-slot, and if there are events scheduled on the first
party's calendar during the first time-slot, independent of any access privileges
defined for such events."

Barnett does not overcome the deficiencies noted above with respect to
Vincent. Both Vincent and Barnett teach the concept of event-based access to a
shared calendar. In these references, as long as the access privilege of the user
and the access level of the event match, the user will gain access to the event
whenever that event occurs and, thus, the access privileges of the references are
clearly event-dependent. However, neither reference teaches or suggests "access
privileges are defined for specific time-slots … independent of whether there are any
events scheduled on the first party's calendar during the first time-slot, and if there
are events scheduled on the first party's calendar during the first time-slot,
independent of any access privileges defined for such events."

As such, Vincent and Barnett, individually or in combination, do not teach or
suggest the features of claim 1 as discussed above. Therefore, when viewed as a
whole, claim 1 is patentable over Vincent and Barnett, individually or in combination.

Independent claims 4, 8, 29, and 31 include in substance similar features as
described above for claim 1. Thus, for at least the above stated reasons, claims 4,
8, 29, and 31 are not obvious and are patentable over the Office Action's proposed
combination of Vincent and Barnett.

Claims 2-3, 5, 9-17, 30, and 32 depend from claims 1, 4, 8, 29, or 31,
incorporating their limitations. Therefore, for at least the same reasons discussed
above, claims 2-3, 5, 9-17, 30, and 32 are patentable over the combination of
Vincent and Barnett.

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 1 and thus is patentable over Vincent and Barnett for at least the reasons noted above. Falkenhainer does not overcome the deficiencies of Vincent and Barnett, and thus claim 7 is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims are in condition for allowance. Entry of the foregoing is respectfully requested and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: April 30, 2010   /Steven J. Prewitt/

Steven J. Prewitt
Reg. No. 45,023

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981